

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**  
**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

Applicant:	Daniel J. Zillig et al.	Examiner:	Matthew D. Matzek
Serial No.:	10/622,973	Group Art Unit:	1771
Filed:	July 18, 2003	Docket No.:	M120.143.101 / 58067US002
<b>Due Date:</b>	<b>June 30, 2007</b>		
Title:	CLEANING WIPE AND METHOD OF MANUFACTURE		

---

**APPEAL BRIEF UNDER 37 C.F.R. §41.37**

**Mail Stop Appeal Brief – Patents**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir/Madam:

This Appeal Brief is submitted in support of the Notice of Appeal filed on April 30, 2007, appealing the final rejection of claims 1-10, 12-36, 47, 49, 51, and 52 of the above-identified application as set forth in the Final Office Action mailed November 28, 2006.

The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-0471 in the amount of \$500.00 for filing a Brief in Support of an Appeal (as set forth under 37 C.F.R. §41.20(b)(2)) and \$120.00 for a one-month extension-of-time (as set forth under 37 C.F.R. §1.17(a)(1)). At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any required fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0471.

Appellant respectfully requests consideration and reversal of the Examiner's rejection of pending claims 1-10, 12-36, 47, 49, 51, and 52.

**Appeal Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences**

Applicant: Daniel J. Zillig et al.

Serial No.: 10/622,973

Filed: July 18, 2003

Docket No.: M120.143.101/58067US002

Title: CLEANING WIPE AND METHOD OF MANUFACTURE

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Real Party in Interest.....	3
Related Appeals and Interferences.....	3
Status of Claims .....	3
Status of Amendments .....	3
Summary of The Claimed Subject Matter .....	3
Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal.....	4
Argument .....	5
Conclusion .....	15
Claims Appendix .....	16
Evidence Appendix.....	22
Related Proceedings Appendix.....	23

**Appeal Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences**

Applicant: Daniel J. Zillig et al.

Serial No.: 10/622,973

Filed: July 18, 2003

Docket No.: M120.143.101/58067US002

Title: CLEANING WIPE AND METHOD OF MANUFACTURE

---

**REAL PARTY IN INTEREST**

The real party in interest is 3M Company (formerly known as Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing Company) of St. Paul, Minnesota and its affiliate 3M Innovative Properties Company of St. Paul, Minnesota.

**RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

Appellant is unaware of other prior or pending appeals, interferences or judicial proceedings which may be related to, directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in this Appeal.

**STATUS OF CLAIMS**

In the Final Office Action mailed November 28, 2006, claims 1-10, 12-36, 47, 49, 51, and 52 were rejected. Claims 1-10, 12-36, 47, 49, 51, and 52 remain pending in the application and are the subject of the present Appeal.

**STATUS OF AMENDMENTS**

An Amendment After Final responsive to the Final Office Action mailed November 28, 2006, was timely filed on January 29, 2007.

**SUMMARY OF THE CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER**

This Summary is set forth as exemplary embodiment of the language corresponding to independent claims 1 and 25. Discussions about features of claims 1 and 25 can be found *at least* at the cited locations in the specification and drawings.

Claim 1 relates to a cleaning wipe comprising a fiber web defining opposing faces and an intermediate region between the opposing faces, wherein at least one of the opposing faces serves as a working surface for the cleaning wipe; and a tacky material impregnated into the fiber web such that the tacky material is present at the working surface and a level of the tacky

**Appeal Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences**

Applicant: Daniel J. Zillig et al.

Serial No.: 10/622,973

Filed: July 18, 2003

Docket No.: M120.143.101/58067US002

Title: CLEANING WIPE AND METHOD OF MANUFACTURE

---

material is greater in the intermediate region than at the working surface. (Elements 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20; p. 6, line 25 through p. 9, line 25; FIGS. 1-3D).

Claim 25 relates to a cleaning wipe comprising a fiber web defining opposing faces and an intermediate region between the opposing faces, wherein at least one of the opposing faces serves as a working surface for the cleaning wipe; and a tacky material impregnated into the fiber web at a level of greater than 10 g/m<sup>2</sup> and such that the tacky material is present at the working surface; wherein the working surface exhibits a Drag Value of not more than 5 pounds. (Elements 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20; p. 6, line 25 through p. 10, line 18; FIGS. 1-3D).

**GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL**

**I. First Grounds of Rejection**

Claims 1-10, 17-24, 47, and 49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Willman et al., U.S. Publication No. 2002/0042962 ("Willman").

**II. Second Grounds of Rejection**

Claims 12-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by, or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Willman et al., U.S. Publication No. 2002/0042962 ("Willman").

**III. Third Grounds of Rejection**

Claims 1-10, 17-24, 47, and 49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Reiterer et al., EPO Patent No. 0 829 222 ("Reiterer") in view of Willman et al., U.S. Publication No. 2002/0042962 ("Willman").

**IV. Fourth Grounds of Rejection**

Claims 12-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Reiterer et al., EPO Patent No. 0 829 222 ("Reiterer") in view of Willman et al., U.S. Publication No.

**Appeal Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences**

Applicant: Daniel J. Zillig et al.

Serial No.: 10/622,973

Filed: July 18, 2003

Docket No.: M120.143.101/58067US002

Title: CLEANING WIPE AND METHOD OF MANUFACTURE

---

2002/0042962 (“Willman”) as applied to claim 1 in the Third Grounds of Rejection, and further in view of Truong et al., EPO Patent No. 1 238 621 (Truong”).

**V. Fifth Grounds of Rejection**

Claims 15, 16, 25-36, 51, and 52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Reiterer et al., EPO Patent No. 0 829 222 (“Reiterer”) in view of Willman et al., U.S. Publication No. 2002/0042962 (“Willman”) and Truong et al., EPO Patent No. 1 238 621 (Truong”) as applied to claim 13 in the Fourth Grounds of Rejection, and further in view of Tanaka et al., EPO Patent No. 0 822 093 (“Tanaka”).

**ARGUMENT**

**I. Applicable Law**

It is well-accepted that, to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, the cited reference must disclose each and every claim element. MPEP §2131. In order for a claim to be anticipated, the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Anticipation under §102 can be found only where the reference discloses exactly what is claimed. *Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner*, 227 USPQ 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985). In determining that quantum of prior art disclosure which is necessary to declare an applicant’s invention “not novel” or “anticipated” within section 102, the stated test is whether a reference contains an “enabling disclosure.” *In re Hoeksena*, 158 USPQ 596 (CCPA 1968). The disclosure in an assertedly anticipating reference must provide an enabling disclosure of the desired subject matter; mere naming or description of the subject matter is insufficient, if it cannot be produced without undue experimentation. *Elan Pharm., Inc. v. Mayo Found. for Med. Educ. & Research*, 68 USPQ2d 1373, 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2003).

Patent Examiners carry the responsibility of making sure that the standard of patentability enunciated by the Supreme Court and by the Congress is applied in each and every case. MPEP §2141. The Examiner bears the burden under 35 U.S.C. §103 in establishing a *prima facie* case

**Appeal Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences**

Applicant: Daniel J. Zillig et al.

Serial No.: 10/622,973

Filed: July 18, 2003

Docket No.: M120.143.101/58067US002

Title: CLEANING WIPE AND METHOD OF MANUFACTURE

---

of obviousness. *In re Fine*, 5 USPQ2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). “Rejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness.” *KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 550 U.S. \_\_\_, *slip opinion at page 14* (2007); *In re Khan*, 78 USPQ2d 1329 (Fed. Cir. 2006). In this regard, identification of a teaching, suggestion, or motivation for modifying a reference or combination of the teachings of multiple references provides helpful insight. *KSR*, 550 U.S. at \_\_\_, *slip opinion at page 15*. “An obviousness determination is not the result of a rigid formula disassociated from the consideration of the facts of a case. Indeed, the common sense of those skilled in the art demonstrates why some combinations would have been obvious where others would not. *See KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. \_\_\_, 2007 WL 1237837, at \*12 (2007) (“The combination of familiar elements according to known methods is likely to be obvious when it does no more than yield predictable results.”).” *Leapfrog Enterprises Inc. v. Fisher-Price Inc.*, 82 USPQ2d 1687, 1690-1691 (Fed. Cir. 2007).

## **II. First Grounds of Rejection**

Claims 1-10, 17-24, 47, and 49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Willman et al., U.S. Publication No. 2002/0042962 (“Willman”).

The Final Office Action states:

“Willman et al. teach a cleaning wipe comprising a fiber web having opposing faces, which is impregnated with pressure sensitive adhesives (PSA) such as polyacrylates [0107] and block copolymers [0123]. The Examiner takes the position that the tacky material is present at the working surface and at a level greater in the intermediate region than at the working surface as the application means for the adhesive preferably applies at least a substantial amount of the additive at points on the sheet that are “inside” the sheet structure. It is an especial advantage of the three dimensional structures and/or multiple basis weights, that the amount of additive that is in contact with the skin and/or surface to be treated, and/or the package, is limited, so that materials that would otherwise cause damage, or interfere with the function of the other surface, can only cause limited, or no, adverse effects. The presence of the additive inside the structure is very beneficial in that soil that adheres inside the structure is much less likely to be removed by subsequent wiping action [0178]. The applied publication does not

**Appeal Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences**

Applicant: Daniel J. Zillig et al.

Serial No.: 10/622,973

Filed: July 18, 2003

Docket No.: M120.143.101/58067US002

Title: CLEANING WIPE AND METHOD OF MANUFACTURE

---

specifically state regions within the fibrous article however the applied article meets the instantly claimed limitations of claims 3-10. The fibrous wipe may contain one or more layers [0241] may be either woven or nonwoven [0053] and made of polyester or polypropylene fibers [0072]. Examiner takes the position that the tacky material (i.e., PSA) coats individual fibers as the article may be a nonwoven that is impregnated with said tacky material. Claim 49 is rejected as the “intermediate region” may be of the applied art may be divided into any number of portions which define approximately one-third thickness of the fiber web.”

(Final Office Action, para. 2).

Independent claim 1 sets forth, in part, **“that the tacky material is present at the working surface and a level of the tacky material is greater in the intermediate region than at the working surface.”** As quoted above, the Final Office Action characterizes Willman as teaching a level of tacky material that is greater in an intermediate region of the fiber web than at the working surface thereof, and references paragraph 178 of Willman as supporting this position. Appellant respectfully disagrees.

Willman describes in great detail the various materials and resultant properties associated with a polymeric additive provided with the cleaning sheet. In each and every instance, however, Willman makes clear that the polymeric additive (and thus the tacky material) is applied to the fiber sheet only after the sheet is completely formed (e.g., *Willman*, paragraphs 70, 165, 167, 180-184 where Willman consistently describes the polymeric additive being applied onto the fiber sheet). In this regard, Willman describes various techniques for applying the polymeric additive to the cleaning sheet at paragraphs 179-183 (e.g., rolling, slotting, spraying, etc.), all of which are in the context of the fibrous cleaning sheet being initially and completely formed (i.e., by the process of FIG. 24), and then the polymeric adhesive applied. As a result, Willman is limited to application of the polymeric adhesive to an exterior of a completed fiber cleaning sheet (or fiber web), followed by penetration of the adhesive into the interior thereof. Notably, the Final Office Action agrees that Willman teaches “application of adhesive following formation of the fibrous sheet.” (Final Office Action, para. 8).

The Final Office Action states that “Willman explicitly teaches the *impregnation* of the polymer additive and makes mention several times that it is important that the outer surface of

**Appeal Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences**

Applicant: Daniel J. Zillig et al.

Serial No.: 10/622,973

Filed: July 18, 2003

Docket No.: M120.143.101/58067US002

Title: CLEANING WIPE AND METHOD OF MANUFACTURE

---

the fibrous sheet not become too sticky”; and that “application of additives to the fibrous sheet results in at least a substantial amount of the additive at points that are ‘inside’ the sheet structure.” (Emphasis original, Final Office Action, para. 8). The Advisory Action mailed February 22, 2007, similarly states that Willman has been interpreted as having more adhesive in the interior of the article than at its exterior face because throughout the Willman reference “the inventors clearly teach that they want the adhesive minimized at the exterior so as to minimize or eliminate any adverse effects [0178], while the article is saturated/impregnated with the same adhesive,” and notes that “Examiner further supports this position in that the interior adhesive is to trap and retain dirt and other particles, that may come free through subsequent use [0178], which would lead one to infer that the adhesive level must be greater at the interior than at its exterior face if the interior adhesive has been relied upon for soil retention.” (Advisory Action, p. 2).

Appellant asserts the Examiner’s interpretation of Willman is flawed. Willman merely states that the application means for the additives applies at least a substantial amount of the adhesive at points on the sheet that are “inside” the sheet structure. However, teaching that a “substantial amount” of adhesive is applied at points on the sheet that are “inside” the sheet structure does not support the Final Office Action’s conclusion that Willman teaches “the intermediate region of the fiber web would contain more adhesive as compared to the working surface.” Willman does not include any such statement or make any such inference.

The reliance in the Final Office Action on the term “impregnated” (as indicated by use of an italicized font in the Office Action) as somehow inherently disclosing an “intermediate region having more adhesive as compared to the working surface” is incorrect. “Impregnated” is defined as “to cause to be filled, imbued, permeated, or saturated; to permeate thoroughly.” (*Miriam-Webster’s Online Dictionary*). Nothing in Willman indicates a different usage of this term, and the Advisory Action mailed February 22, 2007, indicates the term in Willman has been interpreted as having this meaning. (Advisory Action, p. 2.). In the context of an “impregnated” sheet, then, Willman is limited to application of the polymeric adhesive to an exterior of a completed fiber cleaning sheet (or fiber web), followed by saturation or thorough permeation of



**Appeal Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences**

Applicant: Daniel J. Zillig et al.

Serial No.: 10/622,973

Filed: July 18, 2003

Docket No.: M120.143.101/58067US002

Title: CLEANING WIPE AND METHOD OF MANUFACTURE

---

the adhesive from the exterior surfaces of the web through a thickness of the completed fiber web. Because the applied adhesive in Willman must necessarily travel from the exterior surfaces of the web into the interior of the web, it is impossible to accurately conclude that a level of the tacky material is greater in the intermediate region than at the working surface. *At best*, Willman may disclose a tacky material level that is *uniform* through a thickness of the fiber web (i.e., where the fiber web is fully saturated with tacky material); in all other instances of Willman, the level of tacky material must be greater at the working surface as compared to the intermediate region of the fiber web. This is in direct contrast to the features of claim 1.

In addition, the fact that the interior adhesive in Willman is used to trap or retain particles in no way infers that the adhesive level must be greater at the interior than at the exterior face. Rather, as the wipe of Willman is used, particles first cling to the adhesive at the exterior face of the wipe. As the adhesive at the exterior face becomes covered with attached particles, an ability of the exterior face adhesive to retain those particles may be lessened and particles may migrate deeper into the sheet structure where they become captured by adhesive coated fibers that have not yet been contaminated with particles. This process continues until the sheet contains as much as it can hold. This process occurs even if the innermost fibers of the sheet are not coated with adhesive. However, the benefits can be realized only if at least a portion of the sheet nearest its exterior surface is coated with adhesive.

For at least these reasons, Willman cannot be viewed as teaching the cleaning wipe of claim 1 and in particular **that the tacky material is present at the working surface and a level of the tacky material is greater in the intermediate region than at the working surface.**

Claims 2-10, 17-24, 47, and 49 each depend from claim 1. As described above, claim 1 is allowable over Willman. Thus, claims 2-10, 17-24, 47, and 49 are similarly allowable over Willman.

**Appeal Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences**

Applicant: Daniel J. Zillig et al.

Serial No.: 10/622,973

Filed: July 18, 2003

Docket No.: M120.143.101/58067US002

Title: CLEANING WIPE AND METHOD OF MANUFACTURE

---

**III. Second Grounds of Rejection**

Claims 12-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by, or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Willman et al., U.S. Publication No. 2002/0042962 (“Willman”).

Claims 12-14 depend from claim 1. As previously described, claim 1 recites subject matter allowable over Willman. For at least these same reasons, then, it is respectfully submitted that claims 12-14 are also allowable over Willman .

**IV. Third Grounds of Rejection**

Claims 1-10, 17-24, 47, and 49 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Reiterer et al., EPO Patent No. 0 829 222 (“Reiterer”) in view of Willman et al., U.S. Publication No. 2002/0042962 (“Willman”).

Reiterer is cited as teaching tack pads comprising nonwoven fabrics impregnated with pressure sensitive adhesive. The Final Office Action admits that Reiterer does not teach a higher level of tacky material at an interior of the fiber web, and instead relies upon Willman to provide this teaching. As set forth above, Appellant respectfully submits that Willman does not in any way teach that a level of the tacky material is greater in the intermediate region than at the working surface of the web. To the contrary, as described above, Willman is limited to either a uniform tacky material level throughout a thickness of the fiber web, or a tacky material that is greater at the working surface as compared to the intermediate region. Notably, the wipe manufacturing process described in Reiterer is essentially identical to that of Willman, whereby the fiber web is first formed, and then the exterior surfaces of the web are subjected to a spray coating of a pressure sensitive adhesive. (Reiterer, FIG. 2.) As described above, this processing technique dictates that the resultant cleaning wipe cannot have a higher level of tacky material at an intermediate region of the fiber web as compared to an exterior surface thereof. Thus, because Willman and Reiterer, either alone or in combination, do not teach each and every feature, claim 1 is not made obvious by Reiterer in view of Willman.

**Appeal Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences**

Applicant: Daniel J. Zillig et al.

Serial No.: 10/622,973

Filed: July 18, 2003

Docket No.: M120.143.101/58067US002

Title: CLEANING WIPE AND METHOD OF MANUFACTURE

---

Claims 2-10, 17-24, 47, and 49 each depend from claim 1. As previously described, claim 1 is allowable over Reiterer in view of Willman. Thus, claims 2-10, 17-24, 47, and 49 are similarly allowable.

It is further noted that the teachings inherent to Willman and Reiterer as described above (e.g., Willman and Reiterer both being limited to application of a tacky material to an exterior of a completed fiber web) dictates that each of at least claims 2-10 and 49 recite additionally allowable subject matter. Pointedly, Appellant respectfully submits that the ambiguous language of paragraph [0178] of Willman cannot be viewed as meeting the specific limitations of claims 2-10 and 49. For example, Willman makes no mention of a tacky material gradient, let alone the tacky material gradient characteristics specifically set forth in claims 8-10.

**V. Fourth Grounds of Rejection**

Claims 12-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Reiterer et al., EPO Patent No. 0 829 222 (“Reiterer”) in view of Willman et al., U.S. Publication No. 2002/0042962 (“Willman”) as applied to claim 1 in the Third Grounds of Rejection, and further in view of Truong et al., EPO Patent No. 1 238 621 (Truong”).

Truong is cited as disclosing a cleaning pad having drag values ranging from 1.25 to 3.33 N (0.28 to 0.75 lb.). (Truong, para. [0058]).

Claims 12-14 depend from claim 1. As previously described with respect to the First and Third Grounds of Rejection, claim 1 recites subject matter allowable over Willman, as well as over Reiterer in view of Willman. In this regard, it is respectfully noted that Truong does not address the noted deficiencies of Willman and Reiterer. Thus, for at least the same reasons set forth under the First and Third Grounds of Rejection, it is respectfully submitted that claims 12-14 are also allowable over Reiterer in view of Willman and further in view Truong.

**VI. Fifth Grounds of Rejection**

Claims 15, 16, 25-36, 51, and 52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Reiterer et al., EPO Patent No. 0 829 222 (“Reiterer”) in view of Willman et

**Appeal Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences**

Applicant: Daniel J. Zillig et al.

Serial No.: 10/622,973

Filed: July 18, 2003

Docket No.: M120.143.101/58067US002

Title: CLEANING WIPE AND METHOD OF MANUFACTURE

---

al., U.S. Publication No. 2002/0042962 (“Willman”) and Truong et al., EPO Patent No. 1 238 621 (Truong”) as applied to claim 13 in the Fourth Grounds of Rejection, and further in view of Tanaka et al., EPO Patent No. 0 822 093 (“Tanaka”).

Tanaka is cited as disclosing a cleaning sheet having a pressure sensitive adhesive density of 26.9 g/m<sup>2</sup>.

Claims 15 and 16 ultimately depend from independent claim 1. As previously described with respect to the First and Third Grounds of Rejection, claim 1 recites subject matter allowable over Willman, as well as over Reiterer in view of Willman. In this regard, it is respectfully noted that Truong and Tanaka fail to address the noted deficiencies of Willman and Reiterer.

Further, Appellant respectfully notes that the rejections of claims 15 and 16 are based upon an asserted modification of Reiterer in view of Willman to purportedly achieve the elevated tacky material level at an interior of the fiber web. In order to modify Reiterer in the manner allegedly advanced by Willman, the teachings of Willman as a whole must be considered. With this in mind, Willman clearly limits the level of polymeric additives to be less than 10.0 g/m<sup>2</sup>. (Willman, para. [0165]). Importantly, Willman requires this relatively low tacky material level in order to provide desired handling and glide performance characteristics. The invention of claim 1, and thus of claims 15 and 16, represents a marked departure from this conventional approach. Because Willman teaches away from the combination asserted in rejecting claims 15 and 16, it is respectfully submitted that claims 15 and 16 recite additionally allowable subject matter.

With respect to the rejection of independent claim 25, the Final Office Action states that the “Examiner has relied upon the teaching of Truong to set forth acceptable Drag Values for cleaning implements” in concluding that a requisite motivation to combine Reiterer/Willman in view of Truong. (Final Office Action, para. 14). Appellant respectfully asserts that a proper analysis under §103 requires consideration of the prior art references as a whole. MPEP §2141.02. Truong relates to a cleaning implement that does not use a tacky material to capture particles. While Truong does describe a microfiber web, the web construction is limited to either fiber material alone, or fiber materials to which abrasive particles are adhered via a hardened

**Appeal Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences**

Applicant: Daniel J. Zillig et al.

Serial No.: 10/622,973

Filed: July 18, 2003

Docket No.: M120.143.101/58067US002

Title: CLEANING WIPE AND METHOD OF MANUFACTURE

---

binder. That is, the binder/adhesive of Truong is not employed to retain contaminants during cleaning but instead to present an abrasive to the surface being cleaned. This is in direct opposition to the teachings and usages of the webs of Reiterer and Willman, whereby a pressure sensitive adhesive is adhesively exposed for collecting contaminants within the web.

In light of this difference and viewing Truong as whole, then, it is respectfully submitted that the Drag Values produced in paragraph [0058] of Truong have no bearing on the cleaning wipes described in Reiterer and Willman, in which an exposed tacky material surface is used. Willman specifically recognizes that while beneficial, an exposed, tacky surface will inherently reduce glide, and thus increase the corresponding Drag Value. Truong, on the other hand, is entirely unconcerned with the possible ramifications of an exposed tacky surface on glide (or drag), as no tacky surface is present. None of the web samples reported upon in paragraph [0058] of Truong had an exposed tacky surface, let alone the tacky material levels of claim 25; nothing in Truong informs one of skill in the art on how to make a tacky material cleaning wipe satisfying the Drag Value limitations of claim 25. Even further, nothing in Truong supports the Final Office Action's conclusion that the "appropriate Drag Values [of Truong] permit effective cleaning while not adversely affecting the user or the surface being cleaned." Truong makes no correlation between Drag Value and "effective cleaning." In short, Truong does not provide an enabling disclosure sufficient to modify Reiterer/Willman with a reasonable expectation of success in producing the invention of claim 25. MPEP §§ 2121; 2143.02. As a result, a suggestion to modify Reiterer/Willman in view of Truong to achieve the Drag Value of claim 25 does not exist; or, if Reiterer/Willman were modified, Truong effectively teaches that the exposed tacky material be eliminated, in direct opposition to the requirements of Reiterer/Willman. In addition, and in light of the disparate teachings of Reiterer/Willman and Truong, Appellant respectfully submits that the requisite likelihood of success in achieving the proffered combination does not exist in that Reiterer/Willman have an exposed tacky material and Truong does not. *MPEP §2143.02*.

Tanaka fails to address the above-noted deficiencies of Reiterer, Willman and Truong.

**Appeal Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences**

Applicant: Daniel J. Zillig et al.

Serial No.: 10/622,973

Filed: July 18, 2003

Docket No.: M120.143.101/58067US002

Title: CLEANING WIPE AND METHOD OF MANUFACTURE

---

For at least these reasons, claim 25 recites allowable subject matter. Further, and as described above, Willman teaches away from a tacky material impregnated into the fiber web at a level of greater than 10 g/m<sup>2</sup>. Thus, a requisite suggestion to modify the combination of Reiterer as modified by Willman and further in view of Tanaka does not exist. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claim 25 recites allowable subject matter.

Claims 26-36, 51, and 52 depend from claim 25. As described above, claim 25 recites subject matter allowable over Reiterer, Willman, Truong, and Tanaka. Thus, for at least the same reasons, claims 26-36, 51, and 52 are allowable over the cited references. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to the Third Grounds of Rejection, at least claims 32-34, 51, and 52 recite additionally allowable subject matter not otherwise taught or suggested by any of the cited references.

**Appeal Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences**

Applicant: Daniel J. Zillig et al.

Serial No.: 10/622,973

Filed: July 18, 2003

Docket No.: M120.143.101/58067US002

Title: CLEANING WIPE AND METHOD OF MANUFACTURE

---

**CONCLUSION**

Appellant submits that the Examiner has presented the best available references against the claimed subject matter of the pending application. Reversal of the rejections of claims 1-10, 12-36, 47, 49, 51, and 52 is respectfully requested.

Any inquiry regarding this Appeal Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences of the United States Patent and Trademark Office should be directed to Rick Franzen at Telephone No. (651) 736-6432, Facsimile No. (651) 736-6133. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

**3M Innovative Properties Company**  
Office of Intellectual Property Counsel  
P.O. Box 33427  
St. Paul, MN 55133-3427

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel J. Zillig et al.,

By their attorneys,

DICKE, BILLIG & CZAJA, PLLC  
Fifth Street Towers, Suite 2250  
100 South Fifth Street  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
Telephone: (612) 573-2004  
Facsimile: (612) 573-2005

Dated: July 2, 2007

TAC:jms



Matthew B. McNutt

Reg. No. 39,766

**Appeal Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences**

Applicant: Daniel J. Zillig et al.

Serial No.: 10/622,973

Filed: July 18, 2003

Docket No.: M120.143.101/58067US002

Title: CLEANING WIPE AND METHOD OF MANUFACTURE

---

**CLAIMS APPENDIX**

1. A cleaning wipe comprising:
  - a fiber web defining opposing faces and an intermediate region between the opposing faces, wherein at least one of the opposing faces serves as a working surface for the cleaning wipe; and
  - a tacky material impregnated into the fiber web such that the tacky material is present at the working surface and a level of the tacky material is greater in the intermediate region than at the working surface.
2. The cleaning wipe of claim 1, wherein both of the opposing faces are working surfaces, and further wherein a level of the tacky material is greater in the intermediate region than at either of the working surfaces.
3. The cleaning wipe of claim 1, wherein an amount of tacky material per area of fiber web material is greater in the intermediate region than at the working surface.
4. The cleaning wipe of claim 1, wherein the fiber web defines a central plane mid-way between, and parallel to, planes defined by the opposing faces, and further wherein a ratio of tacky material:web material is greater in the central plane than at the working surface.
5. The cleaning wipe of claim 1, wherein the fiber web defines a central region mid-way between the opposing faces and includes at least one fiber defining first and second sections and positioned such that the first section is proximate the central region and the second section is proximate the working surface, and further wherein a coating thickness of the tacky material at the first section is greater than a coating thickness of the tacky material at the second section.
6. The cleaning wipe of claim 1, wherein the fiber web defines a central region mid-way between the opposing faces and includes a plurality of randomly distributed fibers each defined



**Appeal Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences**

Applicant: Daniel J. Zillig et al.

Serial No.: 10/622,973

Filed: July 18, 2003

Docket No.: M120.143.101/58067US002

Title: CLEANING WIPE AND METHOD OF MANUFACTURE

---

by a first section that is more proximate the central region and less proximate the working face, and a second section that is more proximate the working face and less proximate the central region, and further wherein each of the fibers are coated with the tacky material such that a coated volume of the tacky material at the first section of each fiber is greater than a coated volume at the second section.

7. The cleaning wipe of claim 1, wherein the fiber web includes a center and defines a web thickness extending between the opposing faces, and further wherein the applied tacky material defines a tacky material gradient across the web thickness.

8. The cleaning wipe of claim 7, wherein the tacky material gradient is characterized by a reduced level of tacky material at the opposing surfaces as compared to the center.

9. The cleaning wipe of claim 7, wherein the tacky material gradient is characterized by an elevated quantity of tacky material at the center as compared to the opposing surfaces.

10. The cleaning wipe of claim 7, wherein the tacky material gradient is characterized by a progressive reduction in quantity of tacky material from the center to the opposing surfaces.

11.(Cancelled)

12. The cleaning wipe of claim 1, wherein the working face exhibits a Drag Value of not greater than 5 pounds.

13. The cleaning wipe of claim 12, wherein the working face exhibits a Drag Value of not greater than 2 pounds.

**Appeal Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences**

Applicant: Daniel J. Zillig et al.

Serial No.: 10/622,973

Filed: July 18, 2003

Docket No.: M120.143.101/58067US002

Title: CLEANING WIPE AND METHOD OF MANUFACTURE

---

14. The cleaning wipe of claim 12, wherein each of the opposing faces exhibits a Drag Value of not greater than 5 pounds.
15. The cleaning wipe of claim 12, wherein the tacky material is applied at a level of greater than 10 g/m<sup>2</sup>.
16. The cleaning wipe of claim 15, wherein the tacky material is applied at a level of not less than 15 g/m<sup>2</sup>.
17. The cleaning wipe of claim 1, wherein the fiber web is a nonwoven fiber web.
18. The cleaning wipe of claim 1, wherein the fiber web is a woven fiber web.
19. The cleaning wipe of claim 1, wherein the fiber web includes fibers selected from the group consisting of polyester and polypropylene fibers.
20. The cleaning wipe of claim 1, wherein the fiber web includes first and second fiber web layers.
21. The cleaning wipe of claim 20, wherein the first fiber web layer defines a first one of the opposing surfaces and the second fiber web layer defines a second one of the opposing surfaces.
22. The cleaning wipe of claim 1, wherein the tacky material is a pressure sensitive adhesive.
23. The cleaning wipe of claim 22, wherein the pressure sensitive adhesive is a hot melt pressure sensitive adhesive.

**Appeal Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences**

Applicant: Daniel J. Zillig et al.

Serial No.: 10/622,973

Filed: July 18, 2003

Docket No.: M120.143.101/58067US002

Title: CLEANING WIPE AND METHOD OF MANUFACTURE

---

24. The cleaning wipe of claim 22, wherein the pressure sensitive adhesive includes a material selected from the group consisting of polyacrylate and synthetic block copolymer.

25. A cleaning wipe comprising:

a fiber web defining opposing faces and an intermediate region between the opposing faces, wherein at least one of the opposing faces serves as a working surface for the cleaning wipe; and

a tacky material impregnated into the fiber web at a level of greater than  $10 \text{ g/m}^2$  and such that the tacky material is present at the working surface;

wherein the working surface exhibits a Drag Value of not more than 5 pounds.

26. The cleaning wipe of claim 25, wherein the tacky material is impregnated into the fiber web at a level of not less than  $15 \text{ g/m}^2$ .

27. The cleaning wipe of claim 25, wherein the tacky material is impregnated into the fiber web at a level in the range of  $15 - 100 \text{ g/m}^2$ .

28. The cleaning wipe of claim 25, wherein the tacky material is impregnated into the fiber web at a level of not less than  $20 \text{ g/m}^2$ .

29. The cleaning wipe of claim 25, wherein the working surface exhibits a Drag Value of not more than 2 pounds.

30. The cleaning wipe of claim 25, wherein each of the opposing faces exhibit a Drag Value of not more than 5 pounds.

31. The cleaning wipe of claim 30, wherein each of the opposing faces exhibit a Drag Value of not more than 2 pounds.

**Appeal Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences**

Applicant: Daniel J. Zillig et al.

Serial No.: 10/622,973

Filed: July 18, 2003

Docket No.: M120.143.101/58067US002

Title: CLEANING WIPE AND METHOD OF MANUFACTURE

---

32. The cleaning wipe of claim 25, wherein the tacky material defines a tacky material gradient across a thickness of the fiber web, the tacky material gradient characterized by an increased level of tacky material at the intermediate region as compared to the working surface.

33. The cleaning wipe of claim 32, wherein the tacky material level is a volume of tacky material per unit area of fiber web material.

34. The cleaning wipe of claim 32, wherein the tacky material level is a weight of tacky material per unit area of fiber web material.

35. The cleaning wipe of claim 25, wherein the fiber web includes first and second fiber web layers.

36. The cleaning wipe of claim 35, wherein the first and second fiber web layers have at least one differing characteristic.

37 – 46.(Cancelled)

47. The cleaning wipe of claim 1, wherein the fiber web defines a plurality of fibers, and the tacky material coats individual ones of the plurality of fibers.

48.(Cancelled)

49. The cleaning wipe of claim 47, wherein the intermediate region includes three portions each defining approximately one-third of a thickness of the fiber web, and further wherein each portion includes one or more of the individually coated fibers.

**Appeal Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences**

Applicant: Daniel J. Zillig et al.

Serial No.: 10/622,973

Filed: July 18, 2003

Docket No.: M120.143.101/58067US002

Title: CLEANING WIPE AND METHOD OF MANUFACTURE

---

50.(Cancelled)

51. The cleaning wipe of claim 25, wherein a plurality of randomly distributed fibers are defined within the intermediate region and are individually coated with the tacky material.

52. The cleaning wipe of claim 51, wherein one or more of the individually coated fibers contacts the working surface.

**Appeal Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences**

Applicant: Daniel J. Zillig et al.

Serial No.: 10/622,973

Filed: July 18, 2003

Docket No.: M120.143.101/58067US002

Title: CLEANING WIPE AND METHOD OF MANUFACTURE

---

**EVIDENCE APPENDIX**

All the evidence related to this Appeal is on the record and before the Board. Therefore, no additional evidence is identified in this Appendix.

**Appeal Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences**

Applicant: Daniel J. Zillig et al.

Serial No.: 10/622,973

Filed: July 18, 2003

Docket No.: M120.143.101/58067US002

Title: CLEANING WIPE AND METHOD OF MANUFACTURE

---

**RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX**

There are no additional related proceedings to be considered in this Appeal. Therefore, no such proceedings are identified in this Appendix.